REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is amended to specify the phosphors for converting blue light into yellow required for the invention specification (see page 6, line 18 through 7, line 5).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US2003/0222268 to Yocom et al.

The present invention is for white light emission. Yocom mentions white light only in the background at [0003].

Furthermore, Yocom et al does not show or suggest a specific phosphor capable of converting blue light emitted from a blue LED into yellow origin light.

Yocom et al discloses:

(1) a mixture of inorganic phosphors activated with Cu or Ag and co-activated with a halide or a trivalent ion (Claim 1);

(2) a mixture of II-VI phosphors activated with Cu or Ag and co-activated with a halide or a trivalent ion (Claim 2);

(3) inorganic phosphors selected from the group consisting of solid solutions of ZnS, ZnSe, ZnTe, CdS, CdSe, CdTe, metal slicates, metal aluminum garnet and alumina (Claim 4); and

(4) II-VI phosphors selected from the group consisting of solid solutions of ZnS, ZnSe, ZnTe, CdS, CdSe, CdTe, metal slicates, metal aluminum garnet and alumina (Claim 5).

However, none of the above-described phosphors falls within the scope of the specific phosphor of the present invention capable of converting blue light emitted from a blue LED into yellow origin light to produce white light. The present invention as claimed, in order to produce a white light emitting diode, requires one of the following phosphors to convert blue light emitted from a blue LED into yellow origin light.

1. $(Y, Gd, Ce)_3Al_5O_{12}$;

2. An oxide phosphor in which Zn, Ca, Mg, Sr, Sm or Ga is added into $(Y, Gd, Pr)Al_5O_{12}$ or $(Y, Gd, Ce)Al_5O_{12}$;

3. A phosphor in which CaS, Ga_2S_3 or EuS is mixed to be calcined; and

4. A phosphor in which divalent Eu is activated to α-SiALON.

(page 6 line 18 - page 7 line 5 of the present application)

Therefore, the present claims are not anticipated by Yocom et al.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)as being anticipated by US7102152 to Chua et al.

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US7102152 to Chua et al in view of JP2003327961 to Suzuki et al.

Chua is a reference only as defined under 35 USC 102(e). It therefore is effective only as of its October 14, 2004 filing date. The present application claims priority of JP 2004-061931 of March 5, 2004. Therefore, applicants wish to rely on their priority claim to remove Chua as a reference.

Enclosed is a translation of the priority application including a Statement of Accuracy. Support for the present claims is as follows: Independent Claims 2 and 1 of the priority document support Claims 1-5 of the present application.

Dependent Claims 4 and 3 of the priority document support Claims 6-10 of the present application.

The discussions at pages 5-6 and the Examples at pages 11 *et seq.* provide additional support.

In view of the above, the rejections are avoided. Allowance of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman
& Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Ave., 16th Floor
New York, NY 10001-7708
Tel. No.: (212) 319-4900
Fax No.: (212) 319-5101
MJC/sg

MARSHALL J. CHICK
Reg. No. 26,853

Enc. Translation of Priority Application